

AD-A103 577

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF STAFF (ARMY) WASHINGTON DC MA--ETC F/6 5/1
SURVEY OF STUDY REPORTING TO DTIC AND OLSIE.(U)
AUG 81 M KLUKASZEWSKI

UNCLASSIFIED

NL



END
081
DTIC

LEVEL

SURVEY OF STUDY REPORTING TO DTIC AND DLSIE

ADA103577

DTIC
ELECTED
SEP 1 1981

SPONSOR:
STUDY PROGRAM MANAGEMENT OFFICE
(DACS-DMO) HEADQUARTERS,
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The views, opinions, and findings contained in this document are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation.

AUTHOR:

MICHAEL KLUKASZEWSKI

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A
Approved for public release;
Distribution Unlimited

DATA

FREE COPY

26 AUGUST 1981

81 9 01 045

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle)		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED
Survey of Study Reporting to DTIC and DLSIE		9) Staff Study <i>not</i>
7. AUTHOR(s)	6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER	
<i>(10) Marshall J. Bentz</i>	8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)	
N/A		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
N/A		11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS <i>(11) 21 1 1</i>
12. REPORT DATE 27 Aug 81		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 17
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE N/A
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for Public Release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report) Same		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) DTIC, DLSIE, TASP, Study Reporting		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) This study found that Army study agencies have not always reported their studies to DTIC as required by AR 5-5. This report provides the basis to permanently alleviate this problem.		

392950

SURVEY OF STUDY REPORTING TO
DEFENSE TECHNICAL INFORMATION CENTER
AND
DEFENSE LOGISTICS STUDIES INFORMATION EXCHANGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary	i
Purpose	1
Background	1
Methodology	3
Findings	4
Conclusions	6
Recommendations	7
Appendix A	A-1
Appendix B	B-1
Appendix C	C-1

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or Special
A	

DTIC
SELECTED
S D
SEP 1 1981
D

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Purpose:

This study was initiated to determine whether studies have been properly reported to DTIC and DLSIE and if not to provide the basis for corrective actions for delinquent MACOMs and ARSTAF agencies.

Background:

DOD directive 5010.22 and AR 5-5 require that a Research and Technology Work Unit Summary (DD Form 1498) be submitted to DTIC for each in-house and contract study within 15 days of initiation and subsequently updated as required. DTIC and DLSIE use this information to provide a management information system to keep DOD managers informed of current scientific and technical projects and to avoid unnecessary duplication of study efforts.

Findings:

This study resulted in the following findings:

1. Over 50% of the Oct 80 and 70% of May 1981 TASPs were unaccounted for in the DTIC file.
2. Study coordinators could find accession numbers for 18% of the studies previously unaccounted for.
3. 303 (64%) of the studies in finding (1) had to be submitted to satisfy AR 5-5. Of these, 55 studies had been previously submitted yet these were never entered into the work unit file.
4. 18% of the previously unaccounted for studies required no

1498 submission according to AR 5-5.

5. DLSIE receives the bulk of its data from DTIC.
6. Of 398 completed studies only 59% had completed field 26 of the 1498 according to AR 5-5 specifications. Percentages varied significantly by agency.
7. Several study coordinators were unaware of the requirements for submitting data to DTIC and DLSIE.

Conclusions:

The DTIC work unit file is necessary. The file is very beneficial to the Army in both justifying its study programs to Congress and the General Accounting Office, as well as in helping to avoid duplication of study efforts. However, the file will be more beneficial when it is updated. A current 1498 file will be maintained if the following recommendations are followed.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations are provided:

1. Recommend that study coordinators submit DTIC accession numbers with other study data in quarterly update to SPMO.
2. Accession numbers should be included in TASP.
3. Recommend that the 1498 accession numbers be cross referenced on the DD Form 1473 and the AD number (final report accession number) be cross referenced on the final DD Form 1498. Include this requirement in DA PAM 5-5.
4. Recommend that SPMO conduct an orientation program for new study coordinators.
5. SPMO should also conduct periodic meetings of all study

coordinators.

6. Recommend a supplement to this study to determine if a completed report with DD Form 1473 is sent to DTIC when study is completed.

SURVEY OF STUDY REPORTING TO DTIC AND DLSIE

Purpose:

This study was initiated to:

1. Determine whether the studies in the FY 80 and FY 81 Army Study Programs (TASPs) have been properly reported to the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC) and Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange (DLSIE).
2. Provide the basis for corrective actions for delinquent MACOMs and ARSTAF agencies.

Background:

The Defense Technical Information Center was created in the late 1960's to provide access to a computerized file containing descriptions of ongoing research efforts. This file of Work Unit Information System data now provides management information to keep DOD managers informed about current scientific and technical projects. The work unit file allows managers and research personnel to use previous information or ideas relevant to their projects and to avoid unnecessary duplication of information.

DOD directive 5010.22 and AR 5-5 require that reports on Army studies be provided to DTIC. Within 15 days of initiation of each in-house and contract study, a Research Technology Work Unit Summary (DD Form 1498) must be submitted to DTIC. This is subsequently updated as required.

The 1498 reports are submitted to DTIC in two different ways. Several Army stations across the United States have an On-Line Edit, computer terminal capability which enables them to submit the data on the 1498 forms directly into the DTIC system. Other stations must send copies of the 1498's to Commander, U. S. Army Materiel Development and Readiness Command (DARCOM), ATTN: DRCDE-PA, 5001 Eisenhower Ave, Alexandria VA 22304. DARCOM sends the forms to a contractor, ADR Services Inc., which submits them on-line into the system. A tape is made each week on the data entered on-line and delivered to DTIC where its work unit file is updated. Theoretically, the whole process should take two weeks to a month.

Similiarly, DLSIE requires DD Forms 1498 to satisfy its mission of "collecting, organizing, storing, and disseminating information relating to Department of Defense study efforts and other logistics management documentation that may be of interest to the DOD community."¹

If several studies fail to get reported to DTIC and DLSIE, these studies are lost for future reference. The study may have to be duplicated in the future when the same or a similiar problem arises. This wastes significant sums of time and money. Congress has criticized the Department of Defense in the past for not properly using DTIC (formerly Defense Documentation Center (DDC)) to prevent duplication of studies. The House Appropriations Committee stated on 27 July 1978 that:

¹Second Quarterly Supplement to the 1981 Annual Department of Defense Bibliography of Logistics Studies and Related Documents by the Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange, July 81, pg. 1.

The Department (DOD) spends in excess of \$13 million a year to operate a data bank at the Defense Documentation Center which is supposed to prevent duplication of study efforts. Many study sponsors do not interrogate this system to learn more about previous efforts already paid for by DOD prior to beginning a new study. As far as the committee is concerned, failure to enter required information on each study effort into the Defense Documentation Center data bank should be reason for immediate and complete termination of that study effort.

Methodology:

The following approach was taken to determine whether the studies in the FY 80 and FY 81 Army Study Program (TASPs) had been properly reported to DTIC and DLSIE.

1. Copies of all 1498's submitted from 1 Oct 79 to the present were obtained from DTIC. These were cross-referenced against the studies listed in the Oct, 1980 and May, 1981 TASP publications.
2. Where the 1498 indicated that the study had been completed, field 26 of the 1498 (Evaluation) was checked to determine if AR 5-5 regulations were being met in evaluating results and uses of the study.
3. The information obtained was broken down into an agency-by-agency analysis.
4. The study coordinators for each agency were then asked to account for the studies which could not be found in the 1498 work unit file. If the study had been deleted or never started, they were asked to indicate as much. If the 1498 had been submitted, they were asked to provide the DTIC accession number. If a 1498 had never been submitted, study coordinators were asked to submit a 1498 and follow it through the DTIC system until an accession number was obtained.

5. Copies of all information (1498's and other) submitted to DLSIE since 1 Oct 79 were obtained and cross referenced against the TASP.

Findings:

This study resulted in the following finding:

1. Upon analyzing the 1498's accessed from DTIC, it was found that over 50 percent of the Oct 1980, and 70 percent of the May 1981 TASP's studies were unaccounted for in the DTIC file. Exhibit I, Appendix A shows these results by agency.

(Findings 2 through 5 are summarized in Exhibit II, Appendix B.)

2. 84 accession numbers were found by the study coordinators which had not been previously found. There were two reasons for this: a.) the 1498 on the study was submitted before 1 Oct 79 so it did not appear in the 1498's accessed and/or b.) the 1498 in the DTIC file could not be matched against a study in the TASP due to title and other informational changes.

3. Many study agencies submitted 1498's for studies which were never entered into the DTIC system. Certain agencies, for example Chief of Engineers had no active 1498's in the system at all even though they submitted every required form and had copies to prove it.

4. Other studies listed in the TASP were never started and were therefore deleted. 1498's were not required for those studies.

5. 121 studies in the Oct 80 and 127 in the May 81 TASPs were never submitted to DTIC because the agencies simply neglected to submit the required 1498 at the proper time. These 1498's were submitted as a result of this study. When accession numbers are obtained, they will be remitted to the Study Program Management Office (SPMO)

to verify the fact that the 1498's have been entered into the system.

6. An attempt was made to verify that studies were being properly reported to the Defense Logistics Studies Information Exchange (DLSIE). It was found that a major portion of the information DLSIE receives is relayed directly from DTIC. DLSIE goes out on its own and actively searches for other logistics related information, but if the information is in DTIC and pertains to logistics, DLSIE will have it also. Subsequent to this finding, the DLSIE portion of this study was dropped and attention was concentrated on updating the DTIC file. This in turn would bring DLSIE up-to-date.

7. For the field 26 portion of the study, Exhibit III, Appendix C shows the results by agency. The percentages vary significantly among agencies. This indicates that some study coordinators insure proper adherence to this portion of AR 5-5 while others are lax in its enforcement. All study coordinators were encouraged to complete field 26 in the future according to the AR 5-5 regulations. The revised AR 5-5 will require each coordinator to submit an annual evaluation of their agency's study program from which an overall Army study program evaluation will be prepared. Field 26, if completed properly, can be an excellent source for preparation of this evaluation.

8. Several study coordinators were unaware of the requirements for submitting data to DTIC and DLSIE as well as some other requirements of SPMO. There were a number of reasons for this not the least of which is the fact that several study coordinators are new to their jobs. There seems to be a high turnover of study coordinators, especially where military personnel are involved, and there is not

much exchange of information between the departing and the incoming study coordinators.

Conclusions:

1. The findings of this study indicate that the question should be raised: Does the use of the DTIC work unit file justify the time and effort necessary to keep the system in operation and current? The answer would appear to be yes. DTIC is the only technical information center that covers the whole DOD research and study community. The DTIC 1498 file is a source of data for justifying the study budget to Congress and for answering questions from the General Accounting Office. It is tangible evidence of what work was done and which objectives were accomplished by study efforts. This alone is enough to justify the existence of the work unit file from the Army's viewpoint. A more up-to-date 1498 file would indicate to Congress and GAO that the Army study business is being managed properly.

2. Since DTIC is the only technical information center that covers the whole DOD community, it is the principle way to prevent costly duplication of study effort. There is seldom a new problem facing the Army that has not been recognized and studied to some extent in the past. Therefore, it is necessary to have a system such as DTIC's work unit file in existence. The file must be kept up-to-date and searched before each study is initiated to determine what was already done in the proposed area of study.

3. The daily use of the work unit file seems to warrant its existence. DOD managers and contractors in FY 80 requested 13,000

mail and over 30,000 on-line searches of the 1498 file. That is approximately 120 searches per day. It is apparent also that if the DTIC system were kept current and easier to access, it would be utilized even more.

4. Keeping the DTIC file current and easy to access has been a problem in the past. Some 1498's have not been submitted when required; some were submitted but not entered into the file. Furthermore, study data changes make correlation with current data difficult. However, it would not be very efficient to conduct periodic studies such as this to bring DTIC up-to-date in relation to the Army Study Program.

5. A possible improvement to the reporting system could be to channel all 1498 reporting to DTIC through the Study Program Management Office (SPMO). Although this would help correlate data between DTIC and the Army Study Program, centralization would slow down the process of getting 1498's into the work unit file. This is evidenced by the problems TRADOC has experienced with its centralized 1498 reporting. The current benefits of the on-line terminals to stations that have them would also be greatly reduced if the reporting were to be centralized.

Recommendations:

The following recommendations are provided:

1. Recommend that study coordinators submit DTIC accession numbers (or explanation of why one was not obtained) with the other study data in each quarterly update. If the accession numbers are included in the quarterly updates, SPMO will have an excellent cross

reference between the data in DTIC and the TASP. This requirement will ensure that the 1498's make it into the DTIC system and are not lost as many have been in the past because accession numbers can only be obtained when the data is in the system. And as soon as one agency becomes lax in its 1498 performance, SPMO will be aware of the fact and can quickly remedy the problem.

2. Also recommend that the accession numbers be included in the semiannual TASP publications. This will make the 1498 file beneficial to more users.

3. Recommend that the 1498 accession numbers be cross-referenced on the DD Form 1473 (Report Documentation Page) and the AD number (final report accession number) be cross-referenced on the final DD Form 1498. Recommend this requirement be included in DA PAM 5-5.

4. Recommend that SPMO conduct an orientation program for new study coordinators. SPMO could inform the new coordinators of their responsibilities and advise them on the best methods of operation. This orientation will alleviate many inefficiencies due to "learning by one's mistakes" and will also eliminate the excuse of ignorance.

5. Recommend that SPMO conduct periodic meetings of all the study coordinators to give needed guidance and present new requirements. Meetings of this sort will enable SPMO to become aware of any problems experienced by the study coordinators in the day-to-day performance of their duties. Perhaps these problems could be alleviated by SPMO or by the suggestions of other coordinators. Periodic meetings will also establish a better working relationship between the study coordinators and SPMO. Several coordinators believe such meetings will be beneficial.

6. Recommend that a supplement to this study be conducted to determine that, once a study is completed and a 1498 is sent to DTIC, a completed report with Report Documentation Page, DD Form 1473 is also provided to DTIC.

APPENDIX A

Oct 1980

May 1981

AGENCY	UNACCTD FOR	DEL	1498's FOUND	TOTAL	UNACCTD FOR	DEL	1498's FOUND	TOTAL
1. OCSA	1	3	0	4	2	0	0	2
2. BMDPO	0	1	6	7	2	0	2	4
3. DCSOPS	31	14	28	73	27	0	12	39
4. DCSPER	15	8	9	32	8	4	6	18
5. DCSLOG	9	0	5	14	7	0	6	13
6. DCSRDA	8	2	1	11	6	0	1	7
7. ACSI	4	0	0	4	5	0	0	5
8. ACSAC	4	0	2	6	9	0	0	9
9. TSG	1	0	1	2	8	0	15	23
10. HSC	6	0	18	24	--	--	--	--
11. CCH	2	0	1	3	2	0	0	2
12. TAGC	8	0	1	9	6	0	1	7
13. CAA	5	3	6	14	12	0	4	16
14. TRADOC	112	18	42	172	101	1	22	124
15. DARCOM	97	32	85	214	84	1	57	142
16. USACC	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	1
17. MTMC	3	0	5	8	2	0	1	3
18. INSCOM	15	0	3	18	15	0	2	17
19. COE	11	1	0	12	10	0	0	10
20. MEPCOM	7	0	0	7	7	0	0	7
TOTALS	340	83	214	637	314	6	129	449
PERCENTS	53%	13%	34%	100%	70%	1%	29%	100%

EXHIBIT I

APPENDIX B

OCT 1980 TASp

AGENCY	ACCESSION NUMBER FOUND	NOT STARTED OR NOT REQUIRED	SUBMITTED FIRST TIME	RESUBMIT- TED	TOTAL
1. OCSA	0	1	0	0	1
2. BMDPO	0	0	0	0	0
3. DCSOPS	1	1	29	1	31
4. DCSPER	1	13	1	0	15
5. DCSLOG	3	1	5	0	9
6. DCSRDA	0	3	2	3	8
7. ACSI	0	1	3	0	4
8. ACSAC	0	1	3	0	4
9. TSG	0	1	0	0	1
10. HSC	0	1	4	1	6
11. CCH	0	0	2	0	2
12. TAGC	0	8	0	0	8
13. CAA	0	1	3	1	5
14. TRADOC	41	11	60	0	112
15. DARCOM*					
16. USACC	0	0	0	1	1
17. MTMC	0	1	0	2	3
18. INSCOM	0	3	2	10	15
19. COE	0	0	0	11	11
20. MEPCOM	0	0	7	0	7
 TOTAL	46	47	121	29	243
PERCENTS	19%	19%	50%	12%	100%

*DARCOM data was not available when this report was prepared.

EXHIBIT II

B-1 "

APPENDIX B

MAY 1981 TASp

AGENCY	ACCESSION NUMBER FOUND	NOT STARTED OR NOT REQUIRED	SUBMITTED FIRST TIME	RESUBMIT- TED	TOTAL
1. OCSA	0	2	0	0	2
2. BMDPO	1	0	1	0	2
3. DCSOPS	1	0	26	0	27
4. DCSPER	1	5	2	0	8
5. DCSLOG	3	0	4	0	7
6. DCSRDA	0	2	2	2	6
7. ACSI	0	1	4	0	5
8. ACSAC	0	4	5	0	9
9. TSG	0	3	4	1	8
10. HSC	--	--	--	--	--
11. CCH	0	0	2	0	2
12. TAGC	0	6	0	0	6
13. CAA	0	2	9	1	12
14. TRADOC	32	10	59	0	101
15. DARCOM*					
16. USACC	0	0	0	1	1
17. MTMC	0	1	0	1	2
18. INSCOM		3	2	10	15
19. COE	0	0	7	0	7
TOTAL	38	39	127	26	230
PERCENTS	17%	17%	55%	11%	100%

*DARCOM data was not available when this report was prepared.

EXHIBIT II

APPENDIX C

DD Form 1498 Field 26 Evaluation

AGENCY	GOOD FORMAT	NA or None REPORTED	INCORRECT FORMAT OR INCOMPLETE	TOTAL	% GOOD FORMAT
1. OCSA	2	2	1	5	40%
2. BMDPO	--			0	--
3. DCSOPS	33	59	12	104	32%
4. DCSPER	8	1	1	10	80%
5. DCSLOG	3			3	100%
6. DCSRDA	2	5		7	29%
7. ACSI	8	1		9	89%
8. ACSAC	2	1		3	67%
9. TSG	--			0	--
10. HSC	10	2	1	13	77%
11. CCH	0	1		0	0%
12. TAGC	4	1		5	80%
13. CAA	5	1		6	83%
14. TRADOC	47	3	8	58	81%
15. DARCOM	105	28	29	162	65%
16. USACC	1		1	2	50%
17. MTMC	0	2		2	0%
18. INSCOM	0	4		4	0%
19. COE	1			1	100%
20. MEPCOM	--			0	--
21. USMA	--			0	--
22. COA	2	1		3	67%
TOTALS	233	112	53	398	59%

EXHIBIT III